DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 058 822 HE 002 743

AUTHOR Reck, W. Emerson
TITLE ACPRA's First Half Century. 1917-1967.
INSTITUTION American Coll. Public Relations Association, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE 67
NOTE 32p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS Higher Education; *Human Services; *Journalism; *News Media; *Public Relations

ABSTRACT

This report presents a history of the first 50 years of the American College Public Relations Association (ACPRA). Founded in 1917 as the American Association of College News Bureaus (AACNB), the Association changed its name twice and rose in membership from 24 to 3,109 individuals in just 50 years. A 16 page supplement containing letters and reprints from convention reports, newsletters, and various ACPRA magazines accompanies the report. (HS)

ED 058822

ACPRA's First Half Century

1917-1967

BY

W. EMERSON RECK

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

American College Public Relations Association

TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE U.S. OFFICE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE002 743

COPYRIGHT 1967 BY THE AMERICAN COLLEGE PUBLIC RELATIONS ASSOCIATION
1785 MASSACHUSETTS AVENUE, N.W., WASHINGTON, D.C. 20036

Foreword

Existence of an association of colleges and universities concerned with public relations, fund raising, alumni affairs, internal relations, government relations, and other similar activities causes few raised eyelids today. Most college-oriented persons are aware of these many campus responsibilities (described collectively and broadly as institutional advancement). Such was not the case 50 years ago when only a few colleges had publicists or were engaged in fund raising through alumni secretaries. The highlights of ACPRA, from its birth on the day the United States declared war on Germany in 1917 to the present, serve as a modified history of the field of institutional advancement and its evolution from newspaper publicity and alumni notes to a position of major significance in a world being shaped by the revolutionary forces of higher education and electronic communications.

W. Emerson Reck is vice president, Wittenberg University, and one of ACPRA's oldest members from point of service. Active in Association affairs since 1927, he served as president in 1940-41 and thrice received ACPRA's highest national awards—one for distinguished service to the Association and two for outstanding achievement in the interpretation of higher education. He is the author, editor or co-editor of five books related to public relations in higher education, including the first two published under the aegis of ACPRA.

A FARMER'S SON who never got to college but gained distinction as a reporter and drama critic in Columbus, Ohio, fathered the organization whose 50th anniversary is being celebrated this year.

Responding to an invitation from T. T. Frankenberg, part-time publicist for Western College for Women at Oxford, Ohio, 10 persons interested in college publicity met in Columbus on December 29, 1915, for "an exchange of ideas." They represented seven Ohio colleges, the University of Chicago, DePauw University, and Indiana University.

No effort was made to organize, but Frankenberg was urged to arrange a similar meeting for the next year. Because of overlapping interests, it was suggested that the meeting be held in connection with the annual conference of the American Association of Teachers of Journalism (AATJ).

Frankenberg's planning led 24 men and one woman to meet in a corner of the AATJ's conference room at the LaSalle Hotel in Chicago following the journalists' final session on April 6, 1917. Most discussion hinged on a choice of name. Some, holding out "for a type of blatant honesty," wished to be known as publicity workers. A more conservative judgment prevailed, however, and the group adopted American Association of College News Bureaus (AACNB) as its name.

Elected as first officers were T. T. Frankenberg, president; Edward W. Smith, Leland Stanford, Jr., University, vice president; and Bernard Sobel, Purdue University, secretary-treasurer.

Kept alive by Frankenberg's dedication during World War I and immediately thereafter, AACNB held its first convention at the Hotel Sherman, Chicago, on January 2-3, 1920, again in conjunction with the AATJ. Only 14 members had bothered to pay their dues of $1 for the year. Attendance was small ("only a handful"), but Frankenberg's program on press bulletins, publicity costs, boiler plate, and what colleges expect of publicity was greeted with enthusiasm. Frankenberg was re-elected president. Josef F. Wright, University of Illinois, destined to be a leader in the organization for more than three decades, was named secretary-treasurer.

IMAGINATIVE and aggressive W. P. Kirkwood of the University of Minnesota served as AACNB's president from 1922 to 1925 and brought it independence from AATJ, its first constitution, a research committee with broad-gauge objectives, its first published

convention proceedings, the first draft of a proposed code of ethics, and a record membership of 125—about three times the maximum of the 1920-22 period.

AACNB now entered upon a period of expanding influence. Frank Elliott, AACNB president from 1925 to 1927, proposed that the organization's name be changed to American College Publicity Association, but no action was taken. Because most members were newcomers to the publicity field, news clinics were made important parts of convention programs; but Elliott insisted that direct mail, radio, posters, exhibits, and conferences must receive emphasis, too. He also led the group to realize that to become a truly national organization it should move beyond the Chicago area for its conventions, and the 1927 meeting was held in Manhattan, Kansas.

Problems of fund raisers began to receive AACNB attention in 1927-28. In April 1929, the organization went to Vanderbilt University for its first southern convention, and attendance of 44 set a record.

Holding that "the Association's present name neglects and obscures so much of the present work of the publicity director," Elliott again urged a name change and was appointed head of a three-man committee to take a referendum before the next convention. Opening the Association's first eastern convention at New York University on April 17, 1930, President Edmund S. Carpenter announced that the organization, as a result of the referendum, would henceforth be known as the American College Publicity Association (ACPA).

Ink Slings, started by Secretary Don Cresswell in November 1930, became ACPA's official publication, appearing nine times in mimeographed form. First round tables for beginners and "old timers," along with one for women's colleges, were held as features of the 1931 convention at Chapel Hill, North Carolina. A regional organization dividing the United States and Canada into six districts was adopted. Despite the black clouds of depression on the horizon, the future looked rosy and the Association decided to go to Berkeley, California, for its 1932 convention.

FULL IMPACT of the depression hit shortly, the 1932 convention was cancelled, and dues ($5 since 1927) were dropped to $3. Regional activities helped to keep the Association together, but by the time the next convention was held in Chicago in June 1933, membership was down to 139 from the high of 220 in 1931.

Dues were returned to $5 in 1933, and membership started a slow climb. Meetings in the regions, now increased to eight, became so popular that there was talk of holding national conventions only biennially.

In accepting ACPA's presidency on June 30, 1934, Josef F. Wright urged substitution of "public relations" for "publicity" in the Association's name. A motion was made and seconded that the change be made, but following discussion a substitute motion authorized a study of the name change and a mail vote.

Ninety-three institutions responded to the mail vote—80 against the name change, six in favor. Five members said they were open-minded, two were dubious. Respondents to a salary survey showed that the average salary of ACPA members was $2,600, the highest $4,500.

ACPA's program for 1936-37 placed emphasis on interpretation rather than publicity. Mimeographed *Ink Slings* gave way to a slick paper magazine, *The College Publicity Digest,* as the official journal—also appearing nine times. Membership topped 300 for the first time at 302.

Pioneering the movement to promote cooperation between workers in public relations and those in the American Alumni Council, members of District VIII—Iowa, Missouri, eastern Nebraska, and eastern Kansas—in 1937 held a joint meeting with their alumni counterparts.

The move to establish a national office, destined to succeed only after 12 years of persistent effort, was started in 1938 under chairmanship of Eleanor Mosely of Boston University. The 1938-39 program placed increased emphasis on public relations, and the membership goal of 400 was exceeded by 18.

The public relations concept grew among ACPA members and in the work of the Association during 1939-40. A Committee on Promotion outlined a nine-point program to help raise the professional status of college publicity and that of ACPA as a professional organization. One recommendation: a strong stand by ACPA on significant questions in education. Membership, classified according to U.S. Department of Education classification for the first time, reached a new high of 451.

"United in the Service of Higher Education" was adopted as the Association's slogan in September 1940, and a five-point credo was distributed to members. A Committee on Public Relations presented a 10-point program to raise the professional status of the college publicist, among them "reprimanding any member who resorts to tricks, ballyhoo, or other unethical means to publicize any phase of higher education."

HOLDING A CONVENTION in the Far West for the first time, ACPA at Berkeley, California, on August 10, 1941, received "hearty greetings" from President Franklin D. Roosevelt. The secretary's report showed membership at a new high of 554. The convention approved a 22-point code of ethics, doubled the membership fee to $10, and established four annual awards: (1) "to a member for distinguished work in educational interpretation and promotion, for unselfish service to the Association, and for contributions to the development of publicity standards over a period of years," (2) "to a member for outstanding achievement in the current year," (3) "to a nonmember or organization for distinguished service in the interpretation of higher education," and (4) "to the member doing the most effective job of sports promotion during the fiscal year." Past-President Wright, Arthur Wild of Harvard University, and *The New York Times* became first recipients of awards one, two, and three. No sports award was made.

Because of increased war-time activities, the Association's work during its Silver Anniversary year, 1941-42, was kept at a minimum. Research projects dealt largely with effects of war on production and cost of paper, ink, photographs, engravings, and repair parts for certain types of equipment. War, coupled with the previous year's action doubling dues, resulted in a membership drop to 409. At the Silver Anniversary convention in Columbus, Ohio, May 6-9, 1942, Founder T. T. Frankenberg became the Association's only Distinguished Honorary Life Member.

By May 1943, 43 members of the Association were in government service, and membership was down to 368. Discussion of "Activities in Behalf of Our Nation at War" dominated the May 6-8 convention.

As attested by a 10-point program announced in September, 1943-44 was thoroughly a war year climaxed by a National War Conference in Chicago on May 3-6, 1944. Five of the 10 points dealt with war and post-war activities, and much of the year was directed toward creating solidly the realization that America's colleges and universities were serving the war effort well and at the same time preparing to help build after the war a stronger democracy than any nation had yet seen.

Increasing emphasis meanwhile was being placed on the distinction between publicity and public relations, and consideration of a name change to American College Public Relations Association was started. By May 1944, 53 members were on the Association's Military Service Honor Roll and the Association voted them honorary membership for the war period.

WAR-TIME RESTRICTIONS on travel compelled cancellation of the 1945 convention, but with Arthur L. Brandon as president, 1944-45 and the year following were among the most important in the Association's history. The war was leading practitioners, administrators, faculty members, and persons outside the colleges to realize that public relations is more than publicity. More and more the Association and its members were concerned with education's performance rather than with its publicity, and this concern resulted in the change of name to American College Public Relations Association (ACPRA) without dissent at the 1946 convention at Lexington, Kentucky.

Also during 1944-46 the first Association-sponsored book on public relations for higher education ("Public Relations: A Program for Colleges and Universities," Reck, 1946) was published. Other highlights: Development of relationships between ACPRA and other educational associations, and the initiation of relationships with non-educational groups; establishment of a counseling system on public relations for colleges and universities; an extensive research program with published reports; formulation of a new code of ethics (adopted in 1947) based on public relations responsibilities; expansion of services with special aids for returning military personnel; and receipt of the first major financial grant from an outside agency ($1,000 from Marts and Lundy, Inc., New York City fund raising and public relations firm).

Reflecting the organization's growing prestige during the first year under its new name, membership zoomed to 729. Many of the newcomers were college presidents. All districts (there were now 15) held meetings. The Association, through its Public Relations Committee, worked with the sponsors of American Education Week in shaping their 1947 program. Under a new fee structure meant to secure additional revenue for secretarial service and for a national office—still the number one goal of the organization—dues were set at $15 for primary memberships and business and professional memberships, $7.50 for secondary memberships.

The Association magazine (*College Public Relations*), the meetings held in all 15 districts, and the national convention held in Denver in June emphasized 1947-48 as "The Year of the New Horizons." In keeping with its slogan, "United in the Service of Higher Education," ACPRA cooperated with the American Council on Education, National Education Association, Association of American Colleges, American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education, and UNESCO on projects ranging from workshops to convention programs.

The dream of a national office, pursued for more than a decade, seemed near realization when the Association of American Colleges (AAC) in early 1949 made a tentative promise to grant $6,500 a year toward expenses, plus use of two rooms in the AAC quarters at 726 Jackson Place, N.W.

Another year passed and the Association voted to accept a new offer of $9,000 from the Association of American Colleges, to be paid in three annual installments, to help establish the national office. To make possible the estimated $18,000 budget needed, fees were raised to $25 for primary members.

THE NAME of the Association was placed on the door of Room 502 at 726 Jackson Place, N.W., Washington, on October 1, 1950, and the furniture was moved in on the same day. First occupant of the national executive secretary's chair was Marvin W. Topping, previously director of public relations for the Medical College of Virginia.

A loan library of public relations materials was one of the first projects of the new national office. In recognition of his cooperation in making the national office possible, ACPRA voted an honorary life membership to Dr. Guy E. Snavely, executive secretary of the Association of American Colleges.

Through the new national office, ACPRA in 1951-52 joined with other educational organizations to represent education on the Washington legislative front. Another national office activity was a publications service meant to familiarize college and university administrators with public relations aspects of common educational problems.

The Association now moved also to establish services designed "to meet the needs of the increasing number of persons in the field of college and university development with a view to recognizing their activities as being essentially of a public relations nature." At the same time it instructed its Board of Directors "to explore the possibilities for enlisting financial support from foundations, business, labor, etc., for special projects serving the best interests of higher education."

Emphasizing again the value of the national office, membership grew to 917 in 1952-53, and net worth of the organization jumped to $20,807—four times that for the last year prior to establishment of the national office. The first cooperative effort with the Public Relations Society of America—a survey on "The Organization of Public Relations in American Colleges and Universities"—was com-

pleted this year, and a "packet loan service" covering student recruitment and fund materials, annual reports, and sports materials was started.

Reflecting the increasing attention to public relations aspects of fund raising, seminars on fund raising and development were included on many district programs, and "Mobilizing Support for Higher Education" was the theme for the national convention.

ACPRA in 1953-54 cooperated with the U.S. Office of Education on state conferences on education and became a member of the Advisory Council of the National Citizens Committee for Educational Television. A Fund Raising and Development Committee was created "to survey the field of fund raising and development, its programs, policies, personnel, and potential within the framework of ACPRA," and a Public Relations Planning Committee was established "to construct a plan for interpreting higher education to the American public."

Dr. Wilson Compton, president of the Council for Financial Aid to Education, New York, became ACPRA's 1,000th member early in 1954, and total membership for 1953-54 reached a record 1,051. Income exceeded $25,000 for the first time.

In 1954-55, the Association's cooperative efforts grew to include relationships with 11 national educational organizations; steps were initiated to incorporate the Association; organization of a Development Section within the Association was authorized; and the process of organizing an American College Public Relations Foundation was started. At year's end the National Citizen's Committee for Educational Television awarded ACPRA its citation "in recognition of the Association's contribution to the growth of educational television."

First proposed in 1951, the first Annual Survey of Educational Philanthropy was launched by ACPRA in the fall of 1955 in cooperation with the Council on Financial Aid to Education. Through the efforts of the Association's officers and national office, ACPRA during 1955-56 cooperated to make public relations a topic for discussion at conventions of seven national educational organizations and encouraged accrediting agencies to include public relations consideration in their evaluation of institutions.

Mr. Topping, first executive secretary of the Association since 1950, resigned effective August 31, 1956, and in his final report showed these growth records since the establishment of the national office six years earlier: membership from 778 to 1,388; net worth from $11,158 to $40,963.

W. Noel Johnston, assistant to the president of Pratt Institute, became ACPRA's national office administrator on September 1, 1956, under the new title, executive director. Almost immediately the office was moved to larger quarters in the American Council on Education Building at 1785 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W.

Publication of a monthly magazine was shortly authorized and the first issue of *Pride* appeared in January 1957. Organization of a Communications Section of ACPRA was also authorized.

A step many times suggested was taken when ACPRA and the American Alumni Council began exploration of means for "increasing cooperation in order to strengthen the services of both to higher education." ACPRA's first effort to secure tax exemption status suffered a temporary setback in 1956-57 when the Internal Revenue Service denied the Association's application.

The 1956-57 fiscal year was historical in other ways. The ACPRA seal, designed by Richard Beasley, a senior at Rhode Island School of Design, began to appear on all Association publications and printed materials. ACPRA cooperated with the President's Committee on Education Beyond the High School, the Advertising Council campaign on behalf of higher education, the Sears-Roebuck Foundation higher education film, the People-to-People Program, and National Education Week.

PAVING THE WAY for several of the most significant steps in ACPRA history, the Ford Foundation in early 1957 made a $50,000 grant to help conduct "a thorough, scholarly, and objective study of the areas of college and university administration involved in, or closely related to, internal and external public relations."

In one of the final steps of 1956-57, a referendum of the membership authorized an increase in dues, the first since 1949-50, from $25 to $35 for institutional, educational agencies, and personal members and from $7.50 to $10 for individual active and associate memberships.

Encouraged by a survey which revealed that 327 persons held membership in both ACPRA and the American Alumni Council, leaders of the two organizations in 1957 established a Liaison Committee to study possible cooperative efforts. Shortly a concurrent national meeting in Washington was planned for 1960 by the two groups.

ACPRA on February 27-March 1, 1958, sponsored at The Greenbrier in White Sulphur Springs, West Virginia, one of the most significant events of its history. During those three days, 87 men

and women—13 of them presidents of leading colleges and universities—dug into the needs and methods for advancing understanding and support of higher education. The three days of study and discussion convinced the conferees that a new area of administration involving public relations, alumni relations, and fund raising was rapidly emerging and that complete coordination—not work at cross purposes—must be achieved to assure best results.

Compiled in an 84-page book which appeared late in 1958 under the title, "The Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education," the findings of this conference, made possible by the Ford grant of 1957, were destined to influence the administrative structure of many institutions and the activities of ACPRA itself for years to come.

With expenditures exceeding income, a referendum on the question of raising dues from $35 to $50 for member institutions was authorized in 1958. Administration and Communications Sections within the ACPRA were formalized, but abolition of the Sports Section after 1959 was determined. Destined to produce the extensive awards program which would become a feature of Association conventions in the 1960's, a committee began making an extensive study of the current awards program. Their recommendation called for a new program "which would effectively stimulate and recognize high quality work."

First of many which would be held in all parts of the country during the closing years of ACPRA's first half century, an Institute for Development Officers convened at Chatham College for 10 days starting on July 27, 1959. ACPRA meanwhile was preparing for a change in national office leadership, Mr. Johnston having resigned as executive director, effective September 1. Frank L. Ashmore, director of development and public relations at Randolph-Macon College, Lynchburg, Virginia, took over the chief executive's post.

A Study Commission which had been named in July 1959 to assure the most effective followup possible on the Greenbrier Conference was ready to report by July 1960, following a year-long examination of the scope, purpose, and organizational pattern of the Association.

In its 50-page report it recommended: (1) that the name of the organization be changed to Association for the Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education with the name so presented typographically that the words "understanding and support" would provide definition of the meaning of the word "advancement," (2) that the interest areas represented by the

administration, communications, development, and medical sections of the Association be represented in the future by councils on public relations, financial support, and management of programs and an indeterminate number of commissions, (3) that the present 58-member Board of Directors be replaced by a 24-member Board of Trustees—one-third of whom would be elected each year to serve three years—with 11 representing the districts, nine elected from the three councils, three being named at large, and the executive director serving ex officio, (4) that the board elect its own officers and that the title of the executive director be changed to executive vice president, (5) that the responsibility for total Association programs and services, establishment of fees, awarding of honors and citations, authorization and dissolution of commissions, etc., be assigned to the board, (6) that a new dues structure based on enrollment of member institutions be adopted, and (7) that the various recommendations be implemented as of August 1, 1961, under new articles of organization and bylaws. Action on the recommendations pertaining to reorganization of the Association's structure would have to await the will of the membership to be expressed in a mail referendum.

As a result of negotiations dating back to October 1956, ACPRA was granted tax exemption to begin August 1, 1960, under Section 501 (c) (3) of the Internal Revenue Code.

By a mail vote completed on December 8, 1960, the membership approved, 490 to 3, the new bylaws authorizing the reorganization of the Association on August 1, 1961, as recommended by the Study Commission.

The matter of change of name was referred to a special committee. It recommended that the name be changed to American Association for the Advancement of Colleges and Universities, and on June 5, 1961, the Board of Trustees submitted this name to members at the national convention with recommendation that it be adopted. After long discussion, members at the business meeting voted to table the motion to adopt and instructed the Executive Committee to re-study the subject of a new name.

ANTICIPATING THAT the reorganization, along with the expansion of programs and services as recommended, would increase expenditures to at least $130,000 a year, the trustees approved a new fee structure based on enrollment, ranging from $50 to $150 per member institution.

Mr. Ashmore in early spring had resigned as executive director, effective July 31, and James W. Jackson of Washington University reported as his successor. He thus became the first man to hold the new title of executive vice president.

Besides effecting the re-organization recommended by the Study Commission in 1960, and voted by the membership the following December, ACPRA in 1961-62 inaugurated a personnel training program and moved to improve its publications services materially. First the magazine *Pride* was replaced by two publications, *ACPRA Newsletter,* issued monthly, and *College and University Journal,* a quarterly published for the first time in January, 1962. Eight books and pamphlets concerning public relations and development activities were also distributed to members.

The matter of name change continued to get major attention in 1962-63. After discussion by both the Executive Committee and the trustees, the latter decided to submit the name, Association for College and University Advancement, to the membership for a mail vote decision by May 1. The referendum was invalidated in May, however, " in recognition of the views of certain respected members and in the interest of preserving unity of the Association."

During the annual business meeting the membership authorized the Executive Committee to continue study of the desirability for a name change. If the trustees then decided that a change was desirable they were authorized to submit a proposed name to the membership by mail ballot.

Effective August 1, 1963, Mr. Jackson resigned as executive vice president and John W. Leslie of Lewis and Clark College became his successor.

Emphasis on long-range planning, consolidation of districts, a revised fee schedule, and adoption of a more efficient method of district representation on the Board of Trustees followed in 1963-64. The name change was discussed at all district meetings but not stressed.

Another publication, *Education Abstracts,* to be distributed 10 times a year, was started to give members a terse summary of educational items of importance in current periodicals.

Through the efforts of the Liaison Committee, the American Alumni Council and ACPRA merged their lending library services on October 1, 1963, and began considering a merger of their placement services and further cooperation on national conference programs.

The councils (on public relations for higher education, on financial support for higher education, and on management of advancement programs) were abolished by a mail vote of 302 to 2 just

before the 1964 convention, and a system of electing trustees by the districts on the basis of one trustee for each 50 member institutions, or major fraction thereof, was adopted.

Meeting on July 4, the Board of Trustees adopted a three-year budget plan; new fee schedule ranging from $100 to $250, depending on enrollment, for institutional membership, effective with the 1964-65 fiscal year; and voted to reduce the number of districts from eleven to nine, effective on September 1, 1965. A three-year program of national institutes, five to be held in various parts of the country each year, was adopted to start in the fall of 1964. A final triumph for 1963-64 came when the Internal Revenue Service granted the Association exemption from federal transportation and excise taxes.

Work of the Liaison Committee brought a decision that ACPRA and the Alumni Council would hold a single national meeting in 1968 with the Alumni Council serving as host in Miami, Florida, on July 14-18. In 1969 ACPRA would serve as host in New York City on July 20-24.

Emphasizing the potential of social science research in educational public relations and development of programs, the three-year program of five national institutes each year was implemented. The *Placement Newsletter,* authorized the previous year, was inaugurated, three special booklets—"Education '64," "28 Case Studies," and "Guidelines for Gift Records Systems"—were published, and a Foundation Relations Workshop for Junior Colleges was sponsored in cooperation with the American Association of Junior Colleges.

A counseling service for institutions in other countries, to be available when requested, was established as one of the first actions of 1965-66. A major study, first of its kind, of the organization and management of public relations and development programs in colleges and universities was also inaugurated.

The Alumni Council in January 1966, stated its wish to confine itself to "an essential rationale" of "the commitment and involvement of alumni in education." ACPRA's trustees reiterated the Association's desire to cooperate with the Council "on a basis emphasizing joint district and national conferences, the combined lending library, and other appropriate cooperative activities." Eleven of 18 Alumni Council and ACPRA districts met in joint or tandem sessions during the year.

ACPRA's trustees on March 9, 1966, decided that Association for the Advancement of Colleges and Universities (AACU) should

be submitted to members, as the proposed new name. Districts were to discuss the name change at their 1966-67 meetings, after which a mail referendum of institutional members would be taken by March 30, 1967. The new name, if approved, was to become effective on September 1, 1967.

Looking toward the further improvement of Association literature, the trustees named a Publications Committee to suggest possible contributors, review manuscrips, and serve as a counseling body for ACPRA on all matters pertaining to publications. A full-time director of editorial services was appointed, and *Techniques* was established in May 1966, to appear six times annually. The year also saw ACPRA publications translated into Spanish.

Although the membership failed to approve the proposed change of name to Association for the Advancement of Colleges and Universities (the vote being 401 for, 375 against, when a two-thirds majority was needed for adoption), ACPRA in 1966-67 made record efforts to advance higher education.

As it rounded out its first half century, the Association was involved in research projects related to management practices, tax legislation, and philanthropy; five national institutes, two deferred giving workshops, a school for public relations and development officers, nine district conferences, and the annual national conference were staged; the production of a growing body of literature in the field included six regular publications; a National Honors Competition drew 1,067 entries; and other special services featured lending and reference libraries, international relations, and placement.

To maintain a national office staffed with nine persons and to make these services possible, the Association had an operating budget of $201,000 and an additional cash flow of over $75,000 from conferences, workshops and other projects. Higher education had seen amazing changes, and the Association had kept pace since the American Association of College News Bureaus operated on $12.55, largely for postage, during its natal year.

As the Association became 50 years old on April 6, 1967, its membership of 1,007 college and universities, 53 educational associates, and 31 subscribers was represented by 3,109 individuals. Equally important, it was now an organization serving higher education on four of the world's six continents with members in Colombia, Mexico, Japan, South Africa, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and Canada, as well as the United States.

T. T. Frankenberg's dreams had more than been fulfilled.

ACPPA Presidents

*T. T. Frankenberg 1917-1920
Western College for Women

*Bristow Adams 1920-1921
Cornell University

*Nelson A. Crawford 1921-1922
Kansas State College

*William P. Kirkwood 1922-1925
University of Minnesota

Frank R. Elliott 1925-1927
Indiana University

*Maynard W. Brown 1927-1928
Kansas State Agricultural College

*Ralph S. Clark 1928-1929
Carnegie Institute of Technology

*Edmund S. Carpenter 1929-1930
Marquette University

*Earl Reed Silvers 1930-1931
Rutgers University

*Louis C. Boochever 1931-1933
Cornell University

*Robert W. Madry 1933-1934
University of North Carolina

Josef F. Wright 1934-1935
University of Illinois

Frank E. Pellegrin 1935-1936
Creighton University

Frank S. Wright 1936-1937
University of Florida

John P. DeCamp 1937-1938
University of Cincinnati

*Robert X. Graham 1938-1939
University of Pittsburgh

Mrs. Eleanor (Mosely) Collier 1939-1940
Boston University

W. Emerson Reck 1940-1941
Colgate University

*J. Willard Ridings 1941-1942
Texas Christian University

*Harold Ellis 1942-1943
University of California

Edward D. Whittlesey 1943-1944
Western Reserve University

Arthur L. Brandon 1944-1946
Vanderbilt University

Harold K. Schellenger 1946-1947
Ohio State University

Horace C. Renegar 1947-1948
Tulane University

Max E. Hannum 1948-1949
Franklin and Marshall College

E. Ross Bartley 1949-1950
Indiana University

*Stewart Harral 1950-1951
University of Oklahoma

W. Henry Johnston 1951-1952
Harvard University

Edward P. VonderHaar 1952-1953
Xavier University

Mrs. Veta Lee Smith 1953-1954
Marshall College

Francis C. Pray 1954-1955
University of Pittsburgh

Bradford D. Ansley 1955-1956
Emory University

Lynn D. Poole 1956-1957
Johns Hopkins University

James R. Jordan 1957-1958
State University of Iowa

Howard S. Curtis 1958-1959
Brown University

Marvin G. Osborn, Jr. 1959-1960
Washington University

Lyle M. Nelson 1960-1961
University of Michigan

Arthur J. Schaefer 1961-1962
DePaul University

H. Russell Bintzer 1962-1963
Carnegie Institute of Technology

Horace W. Hewlett 1963-1964
Amherst College

James H. Denison 1964-1965
Michigan State University

Patrick J. Nicholson 1965-1966
University of Houston

A. Westley Rowland 1966-1967
State University of New York at Buffalo

* deceased

ED 058822

APRIL 1917 TO
APRIL 1967

50

YEARS OF ACPRA
PUBLICATIONS

The edited excerpts from these publications tell much of the 50-year history of ACPRA.

NEWSLETTER
American Association of College News Bureaus
1917-1930

REPORT OF THE ANNUAL MEETING
1920-1948

INK SLINGS
THE AMERICAN COLLEGE PUBLICITY ASSOCIATION
1930-1936

College Publicity Digest
1936-1942

Publicity PROBLEMS
1942-1946

COLLEGE PUBLIC RELATIONS
1946-1949

COLLEGE PUBLIC RELATIONS QUARTERLY
1949-1956

NEWSLETTER
1949-1956 and 1961 to present

Membership Directory and Annual Report
1949 to present

PRIDE *1957-1961*

College and University Journal *1962 to present*

EDUCATION ABSTRACTS
1963 to present

TECHNIQUES *1966 to present*

HE 002743

In the Beginning

Born in Columbus, Ohio, in 1877, T. T. Frankenberg is credited with founding the American College Public Relations Association (American Association of College News Bureaus initially). A noncollege man, Mr. Frankenberg worked as a reporter, drama critic, and feature writer on the Columbus newspapers beginning in 1899 and continuing for a dozen or more years. First as a "moonlighter" while working on the newspapers, and afterwards as a full time counselor, Mr. Frankenberg undertook varied publicity assignments. One of his major clients in the second decade of the century was Western College for Women at Oxford, Ohio. His interest in applying publicity techniques to colleges led to a meeting of interested persons at Chicago's La Salle Hotel on April 6, 1917, where the American Association of Teachers of Journalism was conventioning. The new association was born, with Mr. Frankenberg serving as its first president, 1917-20. He remained active in college public relations, and in the association, until his death in 1958.

April 6, 1917, Signatories

Herbert Graham, University of Kentucky / John M. Cooney, University of Notre Dame / John R. Brumm, University of Michigan / M. L. Spencer, Lawrence College / Bernard Sobel, Purdue University / Clarence M. Baker, Ohio State / Phil G. Bing, University of Wisconsin / W. P. Kirkwood, University of Minnesota / Harry E. Martin, Mt. Union College / E. C. Hickman, Methodist Board of Education / H. W. Jordan, Educational Jubilee M. E. Church / Charles Arnold, University of Pittsburgh / W. D. Bleyer, University of Wisconsin / Grant M. Hyde, University of Wisconsin / J. W. Piercy, Indiana University / Ralph D. Casey, State University of Montana / Kellogg D. McClelland, Knox College / N. A. Crawford, Kansas State Agricultural College / Charles F. Salt, Iowa State College / Melvin Ryder, Ohio State University / Conger Reynolds, State University of Iowa / D. C. Mathews, Western Reserve University / M. Virginia Garner, Wesleyan College / T. T. Frankenberg, Western College for Women / E. W. Smith, Leland Stanford Junior University.

18

T. T. FRANKENBERG, PRESIDENT, WESTERN COLLEGE FOR WOMEN
E. W. SMITH, VICE-PRESIDENT, LELAND STANFORD, JR., UNIVERSITY
BERNARD SOBEL, SECRETARY-TREASURER, PURDUE UNIVERSITY

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE NEWS BUREAUS

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY-TREASURER
PURDUE, UNIVERSITY
LAFAYETTE, INDIANA

May 4th, 1917.

Mr. T. T. Frankenberg,
Western College for Women,
Oxford, Ohio.

Dear Sir:-

Attention to this letter will have an important influence on the history of your college because this letter has to do with publicity, and publicity and college interests are intrinsically united with each other. Thoroughly convinced of the importance of this fact, a group of men, representing about twenty different colleges, met at the La Salle Hotel, Chicago, on April 6, and founded an organization called the American Association of College News Bureaus.

The purpose of the association, then manifested and now in operation, is to give a dignified place to college publicity, to make it educational and worthy, and to aid the press representatives of the various colleges in carrying on their news campaigns. Briefly stated, this is all the association intends, but seriously considered, this intention is of the greatest potential and dynamic significance, for it is a means for bringing the colleges of the country closer together, for aiding them in their progress, for enabling them to make public their activities and accomplishments.

Surely every college must avail itself of such benefits. Surely you will wish to join this association in order to derive these very benefits. Membership is by institutions, but the individual who is doing the publicity work may become a member, obtain the benefits, and at the same time give his college a national place. The dues are two dollars a year in advance. The amount is small, the value unlimited. You have read the letter. Now, write out a check, for the advantages accrue as the seconds pass.

Very truly yours,

Bernard Sobel.

Sec'y. and Treas.

The secretary-treasurer of the American Association of College News Bureaus was responsible for all correspondence in the beginning. Within the month following organization, Secretary-Treasurer Bernard Sobel (Purdue University) was spreading the word via the above letter—a sample copy to President T. T. Frankenberg.

19

President's Address, January 3, 1920

By T. T. Frankenberg

. . . In reference to the school which he serves, the publicity man finds himself today a more important individual than at any time in his brief past. There are a variety of reasons for this, probably the most important of which is the big change which war conditions have wrought in schools and school managements.

Dr. Charles F. Thwing of Western Reserve analyses the situation very well in finding a fourfold reason for an increased registration. He gives these: first, as a resumption of interrupted educational work; second, a largely increased amount of money in circulation, making education relatively one of the cheapest things available to the public; third, an increased appreciation on the part of the public of the service rendered by schools during the war; and fourth, a reawakened sense of the worthiness of intellectual things as having enduring values and a public appreciation of the part which schools play in realizing such values.

With all but the first of these conditions the publicity man has a direct connection. The fact that education has become one of the cheapest things in the American market has developed a problem for practically all college executives, that is, an increase in revenues. To secure this revenue, they are increasingly looking to their publicity organizations, be they great or small. . . .

That intellectual ideals have a new place in the public seriousness is in part due to publicity, and must remain still a challenge to publicity organizations, since the proper promotion of intellectual ideals involves a technique in publicity requiring practical study and experience. . . .

While the publicity men still are not agreed among themselves as to the extent of their commission and the nature of their responsibility, there will be undoubtedly a clarifying influence created by a more general understanding on the part of the public of the mission which the publicity man has to discharge; and he will feel, as all professional men feel, the obligation to respond to public opinion.

This recognition of the publicity man's status operates directly to facilitate the performance of his professional task, just as the fact that a physician is supposed to understand the ailments of his patients gives an added weight and regard for any comment he may make in connection with health. . . .

On another occasion it seemed proper to define publicity as *news with a purpose,* and accepting that definition it becomes necessary for the publicity man or woman to follow after news which will suit his purpose or the school's purpose, much as a newspaper would go about the same proceeding.

Publicity requires a machine, something more or less intangible, it is true, but consisting in the main of avenues so organized that all information comes to a central point, with the full bloom of freshness upon it. Your school must provide at that focus the trained intelligence, suffused with the purpose of the institution, to disseminate the news to those places where it will reach the public which it is most important to inform and influence. This guiding intelligence must concern itself with the largest possible number of avenues for reaching the consciousness of persons to be influenced, and the element of time must in no wise be neglected. . . .

With the knowledge of the various means of reaching the human consciousness, and the development of a technique which will permit the playing on the various types of mind and heart as the master plays upon the harp of a thousand strings, with the inspiration of a purpose deep and abiding, and with a high resolve, the publicity worker of the future—and preeminently the college publicity worker—will strive with the elect of the world for the uplift and betterment of mankind.

Reprinted from AACNB Newsletter *of May 10, 1920, edited by Joseph F. Wright, secretary, University of Illinois.*

Standards of Practice

AMERICAN ASSOCIATION OF COLLEGE NEWS BUREAUS

Recognizing the changes and advances that have been made in the publicity field since the American Association of College News Bureaus was formed and appreciating the increasing importance of the function which its members perform, we, the members of said association, deem it fitting to formulate at this time the following statement of principles and standards of practice which we consider it desirable for all members of this organization to uphold.

1. The college news bureau as a legitimate and integral part of the newspaper world should be conducted with due regard for the principles generally recognized in journalistic codes of ethics such as that of the American Society of Newspaper Editors, and the director of such a news bureau should, as an individual, subscribe particularly to those parts of such codes as relate to the responsibility, sincerity, truthfulness, accuracy, and respect for decency of the individual journalist.

2. The purpose of the college news bureau is to report to the public the significant facts concerning the institution with which it is connected. Its material should be selected with a view among other things to helping the prospective student and his parents to select the proper institution for the type of higher education he desires; to indicating the worth of the institution's claims for additional support and the results it is attaining from funds already entrusted to it; and to extending to the public educational benefits from the institution through reporting the new discoveries, theories and opinions of its faculty.

3. The college news bureau should be regarded as a service organization maintained by the institution to aid newspaper workers in reporting an important phase of contemporary activity. Its motto should be not "Get all you can for the newspapers" but "Give the newspapers all possible service."

4. No college news bureau should be a party to any attempt to conceal from interested persons or organizations facts unfavorable to the college. The news bureau must stand squarely behind a policy of full publicity, believing that "no one must attempt to adopt publicity or to make use of it for his benefit unless he is prepared to take all the consequences."

5. The college news bureau is concerned with the institution with which it is connected and has no obligation to furnish information concerning the personal activities and private affairs of individual faculty members and students. Neither should it hinder the legitimate efforts of other journalists to procure and publish information of this character.

6. The use of undergraduates in administrative positions on the college news bureau is objectionable since this practice tends to make college publicity of low quality and too frequently discredits such publicity in general among newspaper workers because of the poorly conceived copy thus put before them.

7. College news bureaus as regular channels for the distribution of news have a right to fix uniform release dates upon stories which they have originated and should cooperate to bar from their mailing lists those publications and news distributing agencies which frequently violate such release dates.

Reprinted from The AACNB Convention Report, *1926.*

Suppression of College News

By Robert W. Madry, Director, University News Bureau, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C.

In their effort to suppress the unfavorable news stories that originate on their campuses, a great many educational institutions are injuring their relations with the public and press.

It is an unwise policy for educational institutions to attempt to suppress legitimate news, and an increasingly large number of them have come to realize this fact in recent years.

Real news cannot be suppressed. It will out, regardless of attempts of college officials toward suppression. True, it may be suppressed temporarily, as frequently it is, but the fact remains that a good story that is fit to print is going to get into print sooner or later.

And once newspapers learn that an institution is trying to suppress a story, the chances are nine out of ten that they will give that particular story a much bigger play than they would have had it been given to the papers when it first broke.

Moreover, as one newspaper editorial writer recently pointed out, an unfavorable news story published "does not do one iota as much harm to an institution as does the whispered word passing from mouth to mouth and becoming distorted with each telling. Stories which are large enough to be noticed in newspapers are bound to be known by more than one person, and it is human nature to tell someone else. Rumors are bound to be exaggerated and they do much greater injury than facts placed in cold type where all may read."

When I say that legitimate college news should not be suppressed, I do not mean to infer that college authorities should tolerate for one moment a policy of snooping and spying on the part of any newspaper reporter or publicity director. It is not a reporter's duty, for instance, to peep into dormitory windows with the view to reporting whether students at this or that institution are drinking or playing poker or violating other college regulations. That is a matter for the student government or faculty to handle, as the case may be. Only a few of the "yellow journals" now resort to such tactics to obtain their news. Nor should a reporter assume that it is his duty to send to the press news items about matters that are petty and trivial, as, for instance, the names of students placed on probation; unless, of course, there should be an unusually large number placed on probation for some offense that has aroused unusual interest on the campus. Should a number of students be suspended, however, for some offense that has caused a stir, such as the publication of an indecent scandal sheet, for instance, that is quite a different matter. My opinion is that their names should go to the newspapers. The point I am trying to make clear is that, while real news should always be given to the press, there should also be observed at the same time the ordinary canons of good taste, decency, and propriety; which, after all, are simply the offspring of discretion and judgment.

Three years ago the Easter dances at the University were suspended as the result of drinking that had been reported at the fall dances. So far as I know that was the first time a series of dances had ever been suspended at the University for such a reason. Naturally it was a big story. The director of the News Bureau sent the facts to the newspapers immediately, and the story was played up in big headlines on the front pages next day. It was also given to the press associations, which sent it all over the country. For several weeks after that members of the faculty were hearing from friends in various parts of the country relative to that story. And a good many of these friends asked, in all frankness and innocence, why the University let that story go out; a story, mind you, that the University could never have suppressed had it desired to do so.

And yet there are correspondents in some educational institutions throughout the country trying to suppress news day in and day out. Of course most of their efforts are futile for real news gets to the newspapers by one method or another. And if it isn't sent out straight at first it is frequently badly garbled in transmission. Usually one paper gets the story first. The others are "scooped." You know the rest. Such a correspondent doesn't last long in the confidence of the news editors. . . .

Any educational institution that adopts a policy of non-censorship of news is certain to get unfavorable publicity now and then; but, if the institution is making real progress, the favorable publicity will, in the long run, more than offset the unfavorable kind.

A spirit of frankness and fair play—that's what the public and press have a right to expect of the college news bureaus.

Reprinted from AACNB Convention Report, 1929.

22

College Presidents and Publicity

What has proved to be the biggest news item coming out of the New York Convention was Frank Elliott's report on "The Attitude of College Presidents on Publicity." Press associations carried comments far and wide and a number of newspapers gave generous editorial space. Through Elliott and Nathaniel Sherman, of Yale, we have three editorials and have space here for the reproduction of only one, from the COMMERCIAL APPEAL, Memphis, Tenn., issue of April 27, under the heading "College Publicity" (the other editorials will appear in the next News Letter):

"If you never knew before you may now know that there is such a thing as the American College Publicity Association, a well organized body that keeps the colleges before the country through the newspapers and other publications. This association was in session in New York the other day and it listened to some interesting figures furnished by Frank R. Elliott, director of publicity for Indiana University, concerning a survey made among college presidents on publicity and kindred subjects.

"Naturally the outstanding subject in college publicity is the great predominance in space given to collegiate sports and athletics over collegiate academics. Mr. Elliott said that 128 out of 151 college executives were of the opinion that athletics and sports generally are overemphasized in college publicity. However, the majority were of the opinion that the dominance of athletics would disappear when the press gives academic and scientific achievements at the colleges their proper place.

"On the question of the extension of higher education to a greater number of students, 229 presidents of colleges in the United States and Canada were agreed that this higher instruction should be carried as far as possible to the public at large. Of this number 147 believed that publicity was absolutely essential to the greater extension of higher instruction; 76 found it desirable, while the remaining few found it unnecessary.

"So, it must appear, the newspapers and other publications are saddled with a considerable part of the blame for the fact that athletic achievements at our colleges mean more in the public mind than academic or scientific advancement. But it should not be forgotten that the publicity directors of the colleges have to share a part of the onus for the fact that a football game will get columns in all the newspapers while some academic or scientific victory will get paragraphs or nothing at all.

"Nor can public taste be eliminated from the equation. Whenever anything of academic or scientific worth, that also has an appeal to the public, happens at any of the colleges it is played up in the newspapers for its full news value. But no newspaper editor can make the general public as much interested in an intercollegiate debate on disarmament or in a scientific dissertation upon the metrical beauties of Homer as that public will be interested in the details of a championship football contest between two rival colleges.

"Newspapers can not remake human nature any more than an education can. To the latter falls not only the opportunity but also the duty of making even college men interested as much in academics after they leave college as in athletics. After college graduates have been schooled to as fine an appreciation of the intellectual activities of the colleges as they are to their conquests in sports, it will be time enough to talk about such schooling for the general public."

Reprinted from Monthly News Letter, *May 28, 1930, D. M. Creswell, Secretary, Penn State.*

Down With 'College Week'

An attempt to promote higher education through a national "college week" never got off the ground—thanks to college publicists. New England members were almost unanimously opposed, and their reactions occupied a major part of the January, 1935, *Ink Slings*, as listed below:

"Both Miss Comstock (president) and I agree heartily with the stand taken by members of the New England district of the American College Publicity Association when they voted not to sponsor a national college week. Colleges as such cannot be boomed in seven days, and it is perhaps beneath their dignity to enter into such a project."—PRISCILLA GOUCH, *Radcliffe*.

"A seven-day push won't do a great deal of good. I can conceive such a plan as being too expensive for any of the colleges to indulge in, and I do not think a little dab here and there will help the respective colleges a great deal."—J. J. MORTON, *Tufts*.

"The Administration at Dartmouth College is opposed to the idea of a national College Week, not only because of the immediate association with Potato Week and the like, but also because collegiate education is deserving of the dignity and importance of year-round consideration."—CHARLES WIDMAYER, *Dartmouth*.

"There are only 52 weeks in the year, and Honey Week already coincides with Cheese Week."—W. STORRS LEE, *Middlebury*.

"The National College Week idea does not appeal to me. The type of publicity which our colleges need may be achieved more readily, it seems to me, through our everyday programs and contacts than by such a spectacular means as is implied in a national week. I think I should feel that the Massachusetts State College would cheapen itself to a degree, in participating in a national week program in competition with the many other national weeks."—H. P. Baker, President, *Massachusetts State*.

"Our position is that, as a state institution, Connecticut State College is not justified in any form of advertising nor authorized to undertake such a campaign."—WALTER STEMMONS.

"Having brought the discussion of National College week up at the fall meeting of the New England district with the hope that our branch of the A.C.P.A. would vote not to lend a hand in pushing this project, I am only too glad to tell you the sentiment of Smith College on the proposition.

"President Neilson has authorized me to quote him as saying that he does not approve of the project. He feels that an entire week of concentrated publicity on college education would bore the public to death so that they would be heartily sick of the whole subject by the end of the week. It is his feeling that since we already have a National Education Week that perhaps one night in this week could be devoted to the colleges. As for myself, I feel that it is an extremely undignified program for a college to sponsor, and while there is some merit in the idea, if carried out, it would do more harm than good. From a practical point of view it seems like almost too difficult a thing to undertake. For instance, I suppose that it would be financed by the colleges subscribing to it. There are so many colleges with little or no interest in the project that I am wondering if they could get sufficient financial backing to put over such an ambitious scheme. Of course, if a college does not subscribe to it and gives it no support, that college will still benefit by National College Week, if there are any benefits to be derived."—MRS. DORIS W. NASON, *Smith*.

"The existence already of a National Education Week seems conclusive evidence that a national college week would be a superfluous undertaking. Such a week could be neither very valuable nor would it be dignified from the point of view of the attainment of the educational aims of the colleges involved."—R. D. LEIGH, President, *Bennington College*.

"So far as Wesleyan is concerned, we see no value, at least in New England, in a national 'College Week'."—H. L. CONNELLY, *Wesleyan*.

"We are all agreed upon the significance and desirability of the right kind of publicity all the year around. I cannot see for my part that special emphasis upon any one week is particularly desirable."—A. BARBOUR, *President, Brown*.

Reprinted from Ink Slings, *January 1935, edited by Robert X. Graham, Westminster College.*

Education Needs Criticism

Banquet Address by the Rev. P. J. Mahan, S.J., President of The Creighton University

. . . If there is one matter that I would expand upon, it is this: you, as publicity men, are promoting the cause of education in the United States, particularly, of course, in your own institutions. I believe it can be said generally that any movement—any organization—suffers very much from lack of criticism. I believe that American education has been harmed by the very overwhelming support and friendliness that has been extended to it in the United States. It needs criticism. It has been held as a crime, almost, to criticise our educational organizations and institutions.

If education is allowed to go unhampered, untrammeled, without criticism, as it has been to a very great extent in this country, the result will not be for the good of education nor for the good of the institutions that are carrying on the educational work of the country. And I hope and sincerely pray that the little spark of courage that has come into this country during these years of the depression, that has made it possible to whisper a word of criticism of education in the United States, will expand and that the voice will become loud.

As we know, education in the United States is more wide-spread than in any other country in the world, so far as the number engaged in teaching is concerned and so far as the amount of money that is spent on education is concerned, but there is no country in the world that is so devoid of native literature, poetry, music and art of various kinds, as the United States. There is no country in the world so devoid of the niceness of home life and the beauties of conversation in society at large as the United States, and the fault lies at least partly with educational institutions.

We are wonders in the mechanical arts; we are wonders at invention; we are wonders at business; but what are we in all the finer things of life? Likewise there is no country in the world that has morals such as we have—no country in the world where there is such an amount of crime among youth.

So being yourselves the instruments of education, the sponsors of education, the promoters of it from the publicity point of view, that great world of education in which you are interested is something that *does* deserve criticism. You may be more or less restricted in your work, but you have intimate knowledge and understanding of the work of education, and we think that from your organization should come that healthy criticism which all institutions need.

This criticism in some form or other might be a legitimate topic upon which you might give some thought and perhaps derive some inspiration. I assure you, your efforts along that line will be for the good of education.

Reprinted from ACPA Convention Report, *1937*.

25

Educator Says ACPA Closed Gap Between Colleges and Public

By J. L. O'Sullivan, Dean, College of Journalism, Marquette University

Twenty-five years is a short time in the life of a college, especially when we consider the emphasis given to tradition in education. Despite military conquests and social, economic, and political upheavals, customs that date back hundreds of years are the proud boast of the world's greatest institutions of learning.

Yet within a quarter of a century, the college news bureaus and publicity departments have made such an important contribution to the difficult task of interpreting higher education to the American public that today they have established themselves as a most important tradition.

A quarter of a century ago colleges were looked upon to some extent as being a thing apart from the democratic, American way of life. This was due largely to the carry-over from the system of European life which placed the college career beyond the reach of the ordinary person. The college graduate had difficulty in gaining acceptance in many of the spheres of American life where he desired to move, and was entitled to by birth and family circumstances.

Today the college student and the college graduate are part of the warp and the woof of every day life and the college is imbedded deeply with the ideal of democratic life—in fact cannot be separated from our other important social institutions.

How has this most desirable result been accomplished? Largely through the efforts of the college publicity men and women telling the American people about the true aims, purposes and objectives of the colleges, as well as making clear the academic processes and procedures. Every channel by which information is conveyed to the public has been utilized by the publicity bureaus to transmit the truth about college life to the people.

All channels through which information may flow, contribute something to the thought and the spirit of the nation. Some individuals have been reached by newspapers, others by pamphlets, by radio, theaters, books, magazines, lecture platforms and schools. All of these agencies of intelligence were considered in planning the organized campaign to develop a favorable public opinion for the colleges. . . .

As effective as the work of the college publicity departments may be, there is still a great undeveloped field in connection with the program. This lies largely in the fields of study and research and in the preparation of reference material.

It is most important to determine the effects of the kind of education being given to the students and to present the results of such studies to the public. Some sporadic attempts have been made in this direction, but the result has been neither comprehensive nor satisfactory. Perhaps it will not be satisfactory until it is done under the direction or in co-operation with the public relations directors. Such a continuous study would show some startling results and would be of great benefit to the institutions and the students.

Extensive surveys should be undertaken to determine the results of college publicity efforts. Individual institutions have made some efforts along this line, but there is no comprehensive report available on that subject. Any study would have to cover a large number of institutions in all sections of the country.

The colleges need to provide a continuous flow of reference material for the agencies engaged in the dissemination of information to the public. This does not apply to individual schools because there is a great amount of material available on most of the institutions. However, there is a dearth of accurate information on the whole field of higher education, taken as a unit. A great deal of the reference material now available on higher education has been prepared by those who are not in sympathy with the program, or who lack any understanding of the aims and objectives of the educators.

As a final suggestion, publicity departments should enlist the services of the best talent available in the educational institutions to help meet the new problems which are now developing.

It is time to get the young, thinking, aggressive college men engaged in organized, widespread positive propaganda—using the word in the best sense of the term. It certainly should not be a cause for reprobation for anyone to propagandize for the American way of life, for liberty, for freedom, and for justice. In fact, if we do not, all may be lost to a world of slavery and injustice. No better source for this effort can be found than in the colleges of the United States, and no more competent workers for handling the material are available.

Reprinted from Publicity Digest, *April 1942*.

26

Interpretation: Publicity's Next Goal

By Louis M. Lyons, Editorial Staff, *Boston Globe,* Curator of Nieman Fellowships, Harvard University

. . . College publicity, when it rises to the interpretation of scientific advance, will have a larger, may I say a more dignified role. We are seeing in the war how agencies and departments of government, even the conservative military departments, are having to take the ablest publicists (Elmer Davis, Byron Price) into their councils and give them a high place in their hierarchy of authority, because of the vital necessity that the public be informed—and dependably informed—on the facts that shape their lives.

I suggest that this newly discovered necessity will affect all public relations, and none more than our universities.

To do the job as it must be done will call for a man with an Elmer Davis talent and an Elmer Davis status in the university public relations office. He must be a major executive of the institution, of the grade of vice-president or at least assistant to the president, and high in the councils of the administrative officers. Such an executive obviously needs more than a flare for press agentry. He must have an intellectual capacity that makes him at home in the university, an intellectual curiosity that leads him to ceaseless exploration of the educational resources of the institution, and a proselyting zeal to extend the benefits and uses of knowledge through all the agencies of publicity. I am not sure that he need be a newspaperman. But he must be a man of extensive experience in public relations of one sort or another.

The task of the educational public relations man is double-edged. He must break down the conservative prejudices of scientists within his institution. And he must find ways to present their contributions to the public without the distortion of the sensationalizing pseudo-science "features" that now justify and strengthen the scientists' prejudice against the press. The problem is one in part of educating the press, or a useful portion of it, to an appreciation of science as a service to living—not a field of fantasy and magic. . . .

And it would not be fruitful for the man of large-gauge capacities to undertake such a task until the university administration is ready for it. Such a development must start with the president. Until a president with a creative attitude toward public relations is in command, a really first-rate mind would probably be wasted in the publicity office. A president who is timid about the press, or hostile, makes the job impossible. Any president who desires that his university shall serve a larger usefulness in the community should see to it as one of the bases of policy that a really first-rate mind fill the public relations chair, and that he be given a key place in the administration. . . .

College publicity on its intellectual side—and that is, of course, the side that alone justifies the college, though most college publicity officers seem not to have been informed of this—is now largely self-producing. It is the product of the books, reports, lectures, speeches of its scholars. These have their effect on newspaper editorials and reviews supplementing the news columns, and these obviously have a direct impact on the intellectual life of the community.

Their influence through these channels can be heightened by skilful suggestion and by contacts with the men who operate in this intellectual area of the papers. . . . The college press office should be a channel more than a press-release mill. It should open the way for direct contact of interviewers with returned explorers, with producing scientists, with guest lecturers, with a president who has a program or policy to launch. . . .

The institution requires that a sound basic knowledge of its work, its needs, its aspirations and efforts, its place in society, be interpreted to those whose support or good will its future must have and whose understanding it should seek to advance.

The problem is to get at the material for such publicity, and to get it through the channels of the press. This takes study, discriminating expert selection, much prayerful counseling and collaboration within the university, often education of the press and careful preparation of material to see that it reaches its public. Intellectual developments can be made interesting. They must be to catch the attention they deserve. The task of making the presentation interesting is that of the public relations man.

Reprinted from Publicity Problems, *November 1942.*

27

Make Your Faculty Work For You

By Hennig Cohen, Director, University of South Carolina News Service

When the well of fresh ideas begins to run dry, when routine work keeps you from writing that feature which you know would be good if only you had time to write it, on those rare days when your desktop is clear and there isn't anything to do but look out of the window at the fleecy clouds—don't forget your faculty.

The harried college public relations director who divides his days between banging out home-town stories and searching his soul for new ideas, sometimes neglects certain aspects of this obvious but excellent source.

All too often he provides only routine coverage of his faculty members, contenting himself with stories on promotions or unusual achievements and unimaginative feature interviews. He fails to capitalize upon their special knowledge and experience and thereby misses the opportunity to obtain one of the soundest possible types of public relations.

Not only can the enterprising college public relations director obtain a treasure trove of stories from his faculty, but best of all, *he can get the faculty itself to write these stories.*

The public has become accustomed to rely upon the information and opinion of experts and specialists. It naturally turns to the college faculty for guidance. On the other hand, faculty members often have a special axe to grind, a pet scheme to promote, or a scholarly hobby to share.

This unchannelled source of information and energy might well be used to produce signed articles for newspapers and periodicals on subjects of general interest to the layman. Newspapers, always short of live local material, are glad to print such. College professors, characterized by a normal amount of human vanity and an abnormal amount of missionary zeal, are usually willing to write them.

Stories with a local slant are best but not imperative. Interpretative articles on foreign affairs, scientific discoveries, educational trends, economics, sociology, fine arts, and in fact, almost any field in which you have thoughtful and articulate faculty members, can be used. . . .

Local and regional problems can be used to provide stories by faculty members. For example, the beach resorts and harbors of South Carolina are being increasingly subjected to wave erosion. An article by the head of the geology department explaining the causes of erosion and offering remedial measures was written for newspapers with a circulation in coastal areas. Shortly thereafter, the state legislature created an erosion control commission, and the author of this article was appointed as its consulting expert.

The science faculty has not been alone in providing authoritative stories. An English professor wrote a colorful feature on the unsuccessful love affair of Henry Timrod and a local belle, a librarian made a survey of the library facilities of the state pointing out needs for improvement, the dean of men reported upon the university's international student exchange program, and an education professor wrote a series on the practical use of local resources.

Not only were these articles widely printed, but the enthusiasm of the newspaper editors was such that on their own initiative they sent checks to the men who wrote them.

Accompanying each article was a brief editorial statement containing biographical information about the author. A prominent by-line, giving both the name of the university and the department of the faculty member, was also used. Where possible, illustrative material accompanied the articles. . . .

Not only were these faculty-authored stories an excellent type of publicity and a real service to the community, but they required only a minimum amount of work on the part of the public relations director. Minor editing was necessary to conform with newspaper style, but perhaps by virtue of their classroom experience, members of the faculty instinctively used a style that was simple and terse. They also possessed an unsuspected knack of knowing what would be of general interest and what would not.

Such stories have a particular value to state institutions, where all too often the priceless personal element is lost. Perhaps the most satisfying compliment paid to the success of the experiment is that thus far not a single article in the series has failed to be printed.

Reprinted from American College Public Relations, *November 1948.*

Some Fundamentals of University Development

By J. L. ZWINGLE, Vice President, Cornell University

To most people the term "university development" is a circumlocution. Accurately stated, what we want is money, and the sooner the better. Simple, but devastatingly true. . . .

University development, properly defined, begins with university planning, moves into general university public relations (or self-interpretation), and then into fund raising. Such a progression is logical and esthetically pleasing, but it does not conform to the prevailing facts. The university is in being; it has traditions; it has aspirations as various as its makeup of alumni and faculty and trustees and students. It has immediate problems to meet. It has salaries to pay, talent to attract, students to educate. The functions of planning, interpretation and of fund raising must go on simultaneously. Yet increasing self-consistency between the three must be constantly attempted.

What is the proper function of an officer "in charge of university development?" Is it primarily that of fund raising? On the contrary, it is primarily to interpret the aspirations of the university and to encourage consistency between dollars received, dollars spent, and the priority of needs within the institution. Hence it is urgent—more, it is essential—to ascertain the common aspirations of the university's faculty for its university. I speak of *common* aspirations because, first of all, a university will be only as significant as its faculty aspires to make it. No amount of urgency in any other quarter will substitute for this factor. Now it might be said the *formative* aspirations are not those held in common by the faculty but rather those cherished by certain creative or strategically placed persons within the institution.

Here of course we strike a hard problem. I refer to the question of intent on the part of faculty members. In one sense the creative teacher and scholar has no local habitation. He lives most truly in the realm of his chosen studies. The institution is but a vehicle, perhaps as often an unavoidable obstruction. Nethertheless, I believe it correct to say that universities at their zenith represent more than a fortunate collection of people, each one interested only in an individualistic pursuit. Along with this enthusiasm for a chosen field, the *strategic difference* for the university arises from a certain zeal of the faculty for the institution itself, its educational mission, its scholarly potential.

Here, it seems to me, is the final essence of institutional greatness. Here is the element which makes the difference between stability and instability, provided other elements are relatively in balance.

Clearly it is not a function of the development office to formulate the curriculum, the program, the future course for the institution. The development office is at best a useful servant of the other creative elements in the institution. Good public relations do not arise merely by the repetition of news about the university, nor of pleas for loyalty among the alumni, nor importunate seeking of funds from the munificent. To have meaning, there must be a creative interplay between the development staff on one side and the university faculty on the other side. . . .

Reprinted from the College Public Relations Quarterly, *April 1956.*

29

Fable of Higher Education

the time: 2000 a. d.

By James W. Armsey, Assistant to the President, The Ford Foundation

Once upon a time there was a medium-sized university in a medium-sized town with a medium-sized faculty of medium-sized talents.

It wasn't too good, and it wasn't too bad. It was just medium. And, indeed, it was so average in most respects that it was known as Mediocre University. Old M. U., it was called by some of the academic wags back in those days of the mid-twentieth century . . . Indeed, in a quiet, dignified way, old M. U. was happy with itself. But this idyllic situation was not destined to last. As it must eventually to all human institutions, change finally came to old M. U.

It happened that during the first half of the twentieth century there had been a couple of wars and a crazy mixed up birth pattern. The details of this are too dull to relate, but suffice it to say that all of a sudden, or so it seemed, in the fifties, the president of M. U., like his colleagues all over, became mightily concerned with two big problems.

The first was what came to be known as the rising tidal wave of students, a term coined by a retired admiral who had the good fortune to spend his retirement as a college president. And the second, a thoroughly unfortunate and inappropriate worry for a college president, was money. . . .

You will recall that M. U. was medium-sized, and that meant that it had a lot of advantages. It was, the president knew, just the right size for what he called optimum results. It was big enough that it had an alumni secretary of long standing and a public relations director of not so long standing. It wasn't so small that one man had to do both jobs or so large that a whole staff of people stumbled over each other. It was, the president was sure, an optimum arrangement.

That is, he thought it was—until the pressure for money became so great. He had hoped his trustees would raise the money for him, but they were busy making it for themselves. So he had to work at it *himself*. It got so bad after a time that he was spending his whole day trying to raise money, and he felt this was inappropriate for a scholar of his standing. After all, his job was to guide the intellectual destinies of the university. He was telling this one day to a sympathetic trustee, who, in an effort to be helpful, suggested that he employ a development director.

He talked to his deans, and they thought it was a good idea. So he set out to find one, and having come up with what he thought was a good selection, he asked his board's approval, which they readily gave. He then told his alumni secretary and his public relations director that a development director was being added to the staff.

Well, you can imagine what happened. Everyone began to draw charts. . . .

The alumni secretary was quite concerned. After all, he'd been keeping lists of alumni for years. He went to all their dinners, and he held their hands and went through patient explanations everytime they didn't like those new-fangled theories at the university, especially in the economics department.

The public relations director, an old newspaperman himself, didn't see any point to the whole thing. After all, they'd been telling him for years at college public relations meetings that he was supposed to be a policy maker and sit at the right hand of the president. He'd been so busy trying to make policy that he hardly knew how to write a lead anymore.

But the development director joined the staff anyway, and he turned out to be the best chartmaker of them all. He could write good reports, too. Trouble was that he needed organization, and old M. U. had never had much of that. And furthermore, he said you had to spend money to get money, and it was clear that old M. U. didn't have much of that or they wouldn't have hired the development director in the first place.

The president had a hard time making up his mind about the problems of the alumni secretary, the public relations director, and the development director. *They* were all so logical, and *he* was such a straight thinker that he agreed with each one. And he was easy to convince, too. As a matter of fact, they often said, at times when misery was company and they talked among themselves, that he always agreed with the last one he talked to.

Well, you know, they never did work out their differences, and it's a shame, too. For if they had, I'd be able to tell you how they did it, and it might help all around. But alas, it wasn't to be. . . .

Now, as the new twenty-first century gets under way, only a few remember old Mediocre University. It went out of existence around 1980. . . . No one seemed to be able to mobilize the resources of the university. . . .

Reprinted from Pride, *June 1957.*

30

The Greenbrier Report

In 1958, ACPRA published perhaps its most significant document, "The Greenbrier Report." This publication was the wrapup of a study—"The Advancement of Understanding and Support of Higher Education" —initiated by ACPRA, joined in sponsorship by the American Alumni Council (AAC), and underwritten by a generous Ford Foundation grant. The following excerpts are from the foreword and introduction of this report.

A request for financial support of the program was made to the Ford Foundation. The language of the request defines the objectives of the program and of the conference which was its most important element:

> . . . the results should help considerably in genuine understanding of the problems in the following areas:
>
> *The college or university presidency.* It is impossible any longer for the president to perform well and promptly *all* the duties he has historically performed and is today expected to perform. By far the largest number of his day-to-day duties and distractions are in the broad area of public relations, internal communications, fund raising, and other demands not directly connected with the formal educational program. . . . It is both important and urgent to determine and evaluate various means by which the physical and mental burdens of the presidency may be lightened.
>
> *Relationships between and among the various administrative areas concerned with public relations, alumni relations, fund raising, and institutional development.* . . . The study should provide a basis for determining sound organizational patterns of administration in these areas. It is not expected that the results will demand conformity in such patterns, but rather common purposes and commonly accepted relationships which should exist on most campuses between and among the various functions.
>
> *Qualifications of administrative personnel in [these] areas.* . . . The study should provide the background of understanding necessary to develop more accurate descriptions of the administrative and professional positions in these areas.
>
> *The need for public confidence in higher education.* Higher education in this country will succeed only to the extent that the public permits it to succeed. The level of public support of the individual institution will depend very largely upon the degree of public confidence created in that institution. . . . The hypothesis of the committee is that the effectiveness with which each institution deals with the problems described . . . above will largely determine the amount of public confidence and support which the institution receives.

Briefly stated, the conclusions of the Greenbrier Conference participants were as follows:

1. That not only do the *functions* of public relations, alumni relations, and fund raising exist in some form on each of our campuses, but there was general agreement on the growing importance, the objectives, and the ingredients of sound programs in each of these functional areas;
2. That each one of these major functions is an essential part of a broadly conceived program of institutional advancement;
3. That the need for organizational and administrative co-ordination of these and related functions *is* essential;
4. That while there is no single "best" organizational pattern for achieving this administrative co-ordination at the institutional level, yet in the administration of each college or university, regardless of size or type, there are some common principles and practices of good organization and management that are equally applicable;
5. That the decision as to what *is* the most appropriate organizational pattern for any given institution is obviously a decision to be made by that institution;
6. That there was a clear recognition of the need for an upgrading of the qualifications of the personnel performing administrative duties in these areas of institutional administration;
7. That while there was no agreement on any percentage formula for budgetary allocation for these institutional functions (since any one institution may have far greater need for intensified effort than other institutions), yet there appeared to be general agreement on the need to *increase* proportionately the budgetary allocations for these activities.

31

Silver Anniversary Prophecy

By T. T. Frankenberg

In the next 25 years the American College Publicity Association will, I believe, look beyond techniques. It will consider causes and results. It will accumulate such a mass of data that certain courses, at least, can be plotted with some assurance of success. It will, by that very fact, become an authority; it will be the store-house of information, a leader, not only in education, but in the whole broad field of human affairs.

Sometimes we forget that only by stretching figures can even five per cent of the public claim a college connection. The other 95 per cent of the public has to be reached. They control. Their judgment on what publicity men and women do, and say, will make or break the practice, although it can never break the foundation of need and service on which it stands.

Too bad that when the next 25 years roll around, some of us will not be here to see how nearly true these things shall be. But 25 years ago, no one would have believed that the American College Publicity Association of today would be possible.

Reprinted from Publicity Digest, *April 1942*

Higher Education on the Move

academic year	no. of colleges	enrollment	undergrad. degrees	graduate degrees	ACPRA member reps.
1919-20	1,041	597,880	48,622	4,894	40
1939-40	1,708	1,494,203	186,500	30,021	451
1959-60	2,008	3,215,544	392,440	84,264	1,631
1965-66	2,207	5,526,325	536,000 est.	143,000 est.	2,896
1975-76 est.	——	8,995,000	930,000	272,100	——

($ in thousands; add 000)

academic year	total expenditures	current income	private gifts	endowment and non-expend. funds	physical plant
1919-20	not avail.	$200,136	$66,999	$569,082	$748,121
1939-40	$678,560	$720,095	$99,632	$1,766,064	$2,768,279
1959-60	$5,627,962	$5,785,537	$788,797	$5,572,175	$14,652,697
1965-66 est.	$11,400,000	——	——	$9,600,000	——
1975-76 est.	$22,500,000	——	——	——	——

* figures based on 1966 *Digest of Educational Events* and the new *Projections of Educational Statistics to 1975-76*, both published by U.S. Office of Education.

32